## **REMARKS**

In the Office action mailed November 24, 2003, claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on Murdock et al. (US5983010) and Nielsen et al. (EP051368). Applicant traverses these rejections, but nonetheless cancels claims 1-21 without prejudice.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the helpful telephone interview on February 11, 2004, and presents new claims 22-30 in view of the points discussed therein. Applicant believes that the newly added claims are drafted in a manner consistent with the Examiner's suggestions for increased interrelationships between the various claim elements. Applicant believes that the newly added claims are allowable, because, among other reasons, none of the cited references disclose or suggest a system or method that includes an electronic profile of a user's building, such as a home, as it existed at the time of construction, and which also enables the user to input post-construction details regarding various assets in the home, such as light fixtures, paint, window treatments, that were installed in the building after the construction of the building. Further, none of the references disclose or suggest such as system or method that further includes a build-to-order application configured to enable an authorized user to request a preliminary estimate for a construction or remodeling project, based on the electronic profile, as updated by the user with post-construction assets. These features have the advantage that they enable a user to create a dynamic profile of his home or other building, which may be updated as the building is updated, and which may serve as an aid in estimating the materials, cost, fixtures, furniture, etc., required for a particular building or remodeling project. These features and advantages are entirely absent from the cited prior art, and therefore applicants believe claims 22-30 are allowable.

The above amendments and remarks are believed to address fully the Examiner's rejections, and place the application in condition for allowance. A prompt indication of the same respectfully is requested. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if any issues remain that may be resolved by a telephonic interview.

## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, Virginia, on April 26, 2004.

George Painter

Date of Signature: April 26, 2004

Respectfully submitted, KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.

M. Mathew Hen for

Mark D. Alleman

Customer No. 23581

Registration No. 42,257

of Attorneys for Applicants

520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200

Portland, Oregon 97204

Telephone: (503) 224-6655

Facsimile: (503) 295-6679